

V. REMARKS

The Office Action states that claims 1-9 of this application conflict with claims 1 and 2 of co-pending Application No. 10/697,974 (SHO-0047). Applicants would like to advise the Examiner that claims 1-5 of the co-pending application are now cancelled and new claims 6-10 are added. It is respectfully submitted that none of the new claims 6-10 encompasses similar or conflicting claimed subject matter. Specifically, none of the new claims addresses the claimed feature of "pitch" in the present application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have maintained a clear line of demarcation between the applications as required by the Examiner. As result, withdrawal of the assertion of double-patenting is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takemoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,965). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takemoto teaches an interconnect device for electrically coupling a test instrument and a circuit board having a first portion of a ball grid array connector mounted thereon. The interconnect device includes a pin header and a second portion of the ball grid array. The second portion is mounted on a pin support member and includes a plurality of electrically conductive contact members with each being electrically coupled to a respective terminal pin of the pin header. The interconnect device also includes a circuit substrate having a plurality of electrical connection points formed on a surface thereof and being adapted to be electrically coupled to the test instrument. A socket receptacle is mounted on the circuit substrate and has a plurality of pin receptacles adapted to removably receive a respective one of the terminal pins and being electrically coupled to a respective electrical connection point.

Claim 1 is directed to a display device provided in a gaming machine. Claim 1 recites that a pitch P between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors

respectively, and a distance d from the display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of: $P < \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d$.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch P between pixel units and a distance d from the display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfies the relationship of: $P < \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d$. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 2 is directed to a display device provided in a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine. Claim 2 recites that a pitch P between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, a distance d from the display device to a player in a normal game posture, and a correction value α satisfy a relationship of: $P = \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ where the correction value α is ± 0.2 .

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 2. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest that a pitch P between pixel units, a distance d from a display device to a player in a normal game posture, and a correction value α satisfy a relationship of: $P = \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ where the correction value α is ± 0.2 . Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 5 is directed to a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine that includes a display unit constituted by arranging in matrix a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes that display predetermined colors respectively. Claim 5

recites that, in the display unit, a pitch P between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, and a distance d from the display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of: $P < \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d$.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 5. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch P between pixel units and a distance d from a display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of: $P < \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d$. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 6 is directed to a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine that includes a display unit constituted by arranging in matrix a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes that display predetermined colors respectively. Claim 6 recites that, in the display unit, a pitch P between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, a distance d from the display device to a player in a normal game posture and a correction value α satisfy a relationship of: $P = \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ where the correction value α is ± 0.2 .

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 6. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch P between pixel units, a distance d from a display device to a player in a normal game posture and a correction value α satisfy a relationship of: $P = \tan (\pi/180/35) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ where the correction value α is ± 0.2 . Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite. For instance, claim 4 recites that one pixel is constituted by a pair of the pixel units that are adjacent and information signals for one pixel are supplied in the same timing to pixel electrodes for the same color that are contained in the pair of pixel units respectively.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 5 and includes all of the features of claim 5. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 5 is allowable as well as for the features they recite. For instance, claim 9 recites that one pixel is constituted by a pair of the pixel units that are adjacent and information signals for one pixel are supplied in the same timing to pixel electrodes for the same color that are contained in the pair of pixel units respectively.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same,

the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 6, 2007

By:


Carl Schaukewitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 955-3750

Fax: (202) 955-3751

Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (three months)

DC266537.DOC